

Date: Mon, 25 Apr 94 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #183
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 25 Apr 94 Volume 94 : Issue 183

Today's Topics:

 /AA? (I'm confused)
 10.5-10.55 Ghz restrictions?
 [News] FCC Gets New Weapon
 FCC computers (2 msgs)
 GREEN CARD LOTTERY- FINA (2 msgs)
 Upgraded license expiration question (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 23 Apr 94 22:25:00 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!crash!news.sprintlink.net!wyvern!exchange!
john.tant@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: /AA? (I'm confused)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>Message-ID: <CoKHMD.M02@fc.hp.com>
>Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>Organization: Hewlett-Packard Fort Collins Site

> : My confusion arises because the FCC does not require a
> : change of call signs. Does this mean that if NONNN were to go
> : from Technician to Advanced without requesting a change in
> : call sign, (s)he would be required to use NONNN/AA while the
> : upgrade was being processed but could go back to plain old
> : NONNN once the new license was received!!!???

>Yes, but the /AA is only needed when you're using frequencies reserved for
>Advanced class and above only. If you're a Technician and upgrade, you
>don't
>need to use /AA when operating in the bands you had access to when you wer
>a Technician class licensee.

>John Schmidt, NK0R
>jws@fc.hp.com

Although, he would certainly be permitted to. After all, he would have done
something most hams never do, upgrade to advanced. Let him brag for a few
days! He's earned it!

John, N4XAN

* WaveRdr 1.0 [NR] * UNREGISTERED EVALUATION COP

Date: Thu, 21 Apr 1994 09:47:32 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!ftpbox!mothost!lmpsbbs!NewsWatcher!
user@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 10.5-10.55 Ghz restrictions?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <tony_carwile-190494165828@sps157.lds.loral.com>,
tony_carwile@lds.loral.com (Tony Carwile) wrote:

> Can anyone tell me what FCC restrictions exist for transmissions in the
> 10.5 - 10.55 Ghz range? This is reportedly the freq range used by the
> automatic
> door openers at grocery stores, Wal-Marts, etc.
>
> Any information or pointers to on-line reference material will be greatly
> appreciated. Thanx.
>
> *-----*
> Tony Carwile
> Loral Data Systems
> Sarasota, Fl.

This frequency range is officially allocated to the RadioLocation Service.
That is the service covering the use of positioning and speed measuring

devices, including police radar. It may also be used on a secondary low power basis as one of the infamous Industrial, Scientific, and Medical (ISM) bands. I do not have the most recent issue of Part 90 or Part 90 and will refrain from making specific comments which may be based on older information. Download those sections from an appropriate FTP source and wait for additional comments from others here on the net.

--

Karl Beckman, P.E. < STUPIDITY is an elemental force for which >
Motorola Comm - Fixed Data < no earthquake is a match. -- Karl Kraus >

The statements and opinions expressed here are not those of Motorola Inc. Motorola paid a marketing firm a huge sum of money to get their opinions; they have made it clear that they do not wish to share those of employees.

Amateur radio WA8NVW @ K8MR.NEOH.USA.NA

NavyMARS VBH @ NOGBN.NOASI

Date: Mon, 25 Apr 1994 09:12:17 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: [News] FCC Gets New Weapon
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

AP Article Title: FCC Gets New Weapon Vs. Pirates

WASHINGTON (AP) -- The radio police have a new weapon to fight pirates of the airways.

The Federal Communications Commission on Friday showed off a car equipped with two computers, a color printer and a satellite receiver in the trunk. Driven through cities and neighborhoods, it can detect unlicensed radio signals and signals that may cause interference.

"This will give us a lot of advantages against the bad guys, no doubt about it," FCC Chairman Reed Hundt said, standing next to a dusty blue Chevrolet Caprice parked on 20th Street.

By June the FCC will have 10 such cars, each installed with \$75,000 worth of equipment. The commission would not say which of its 35 field offices, located in most major cities, will be the first to receive the cars.

The goal is to eventually give each field office at least two cars. How soon that happens, Hundt said, depends on Congress' appropriations to the agency.

The FCC finds about two or three pirated radio signals a month, ranging from people trying to operate low power FM radio stations to taxi cab dispatchers. Businesses and boat operators, however, are the biggest culprits, said commission spokesman Steve Svab.

Inside each car is a control station between the driver and passenger seats. It features a mobile phone, a computer keyboard and two small screens: one for computer commands and the other for display maps and other information.

With the equipment, an FCC agent can pick up a radio signal, delve into a data base to find out if it is authorized and pinpoint the location of the transmitter, said Jim Higgins, an FCC engineer who helped design the system.

In addition, data can be transmitted from the car to a central location or from one car to another.

Right now, field agents can't do any of these things from a car and must rely on less sophisticated equipment inside their offices to track down unlicensed signals and interference problems, Svab said.

Pirates who are caught can be fined up to several thousand dollars a day.

Date: 23 Apr 1994 22:50:48 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!
bigfoot.wustl.edu!cec3!jlw3@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: FCC computers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:
: jlw3@cec3.wustl.edu (Jesse L Wei) writes:

: >Here's the latest FCC laugh -- I called the Gettysburg office today and
: >the first thing I heard was "our computers are down. . ."
: >Go figure. . .Does this mean processing times will fall another week behind???
: Depends on how much time the people at Gettysburg spend on the phone
: answering questions vs. issuing licenses.

I don't know if you were trying to be *smart* but FYI, the people there don't answer questions until *they* answer the phone. Their answering machine doesn't count. And also, if you still think you're smart, I was instructed by both the VEC and the ARRL to call the FCC as I have been waiting for my license for over 17 weeks.

Date: Sat, 23 Apr 1994 00:09:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!
news.pipeline.com!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: FCC computers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

j1w3@cec3.wustl.edu (Jesse L Wei) writes:

>Here's the latest FCC laugh -- I called the Gettysburg office today and
>the first thing I heard was "our computers are down. . ."
>
>Go figure. . .Does this mean processing times will fall another week behind???
>
>--jesse

Depends on how much time the people at Gettysburg spend on the phone
answering questions vs. issuing licenses.

Dan N8PKV

--

The president [Clinton - Sworn Defender of the US Constitution] said he
directed advisers to craft a policy allowing police to search public
housing for weapons in the wake of a federal court order barring Chicago
officials from conducting sweeps without search warrants.

-Source AP/Chicago Tribune 4/10/94

Date: Sat, 23 Apr 94 22:25:00 -0500

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!crash!news.sprintlink.net!wyvern!exchange!

john.tant@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: GREEN CARD LOTTERY- FINA

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>>Message-ID: <2odl7t\$48n@herald.indirect.com>

>Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy,wu.cs.general

>Organization: Canter & Siegel

>Green Card Lottery 1994 May Be The Last One!

>THE DEADLINE HAS BEEN ANNOUNCED.

>The Green Card Lottery is a completely legal program giving away a

>certain annual allotment of Green Cards to persons born in certain

>For FREE information via Email, send request to

>cslaw@indirect.com

text omitted

>--

>*****

>Canter & Siegel, Immigration Attorneys

>3333 E Camelback Road, Ste 250, Phoenix AZ 85018 USA

>cslaw@indirect.com telephone (602)661-3911 Fax (602) 451-7617

Would somebody please tell me what the H### this has to do with
amateur radio, weather, science, mathematics or any of the other
newsgroups it is showing up on. This looks a whole lot like a
solicitation to me. I don't want your d### junk mail flyers.
Many of us have to pay for what we download.

John

an honest-to-God, born here, work here, pay taxes here, English-speaking
American who is the descendent of LEGAL immigrants.

* WaveRdr 1.0 [NR] * UNREGISTERED EVALUATION COP

Date: 24 Apr 1994 15:20:09 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!bigfoot.wustl.edu!cec3!
j1w3@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: GREEN CARD LOTTERY- FINA
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

John Tant (john.tant@exchange.com) wrote:

: Would somebody please tell me what the H### this has to do with
: amateur radio, weather, science, mathematics or any of the other
: newsgroups it is showing up on. This looks a whole lot like a
: solicitation to me. I don't want your d### junk mail flyers.
: Many of us have to pay for what we download.

Yes, yes, we've all heard it before. But you're a couple of weeks
late, this was posted quite a while ago and is stukk being actively
discussed in news.admin.policy, if you want to pay even more to find
out that he plans to turn usenet into a huge advertising forum.

: an honest-to-God, born here, work here, pay taxes here, English-speaking
: American who is the descendent of LEGAL immigrants.

Playing Devil's advocate here, the green card issue (while I certainly
despise it) was aimed at people who *were* legally in the states, for
example on educational visa, work permits, etc. Incidentally, it has
not been particularly welcome, especially when it went to *every*
newsgroup!

--jesse

Date: 23 Apr 94 20:28:17 GMT
From: gsm001!gsm001.mendelson.com!gsmlrn@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Upgraded license expiration question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Bruce Lifter (bal@ccd.harris.com) wrote:

: It seems like all this group talks about is the code/no-code debate. In order
: to maybe stimulate a different thread, I pose the following question:

: A question about United States call sign expiration.

: If you receive a new call sign, when does the old call sign expire?

: For example:

: A person takes an examination and upgrades their license. The
: person wants a new call sign so they check the box on the 610 form
: requesting a new call.

: It is my understanding (provided that the person already has a license)
: that the person can operate with their old call sign for a period time
: (365 days?) with their new privileges. When the new call comes in the
: mail, the person is supposed to quit using the old call and use the
: new call.

: But what if for some reason they don't care for the new call?
: Can they continue to use the old call and in the mean time apply for a
: new call? If they do, is this illegal? If illegal, when does the old call
: expire?.. At the date of issue by the FCC?... At the time that the
: person signs the new license?

I know someone this happened to. She upgraded to extra and received AAxFU.
She did not want this call, and was quite offended by it. She was so embarased
that she refused to use it. She called the FCC and was told that her old
call was "deleted" when the new one was assigned. SHE WAS NO LONGER ALLOWED TO
USE HER OLD CALL. She had to either use the new one or stay off the radio
until her 610 form requesting a new one was processed.

There was a happy ending to this story. Due to intervention by her
congressperson she had her new call within a week.

Geoff.

--

"I am number six. Others come and others go, but I am always number six."
(From the movie "Eminent Domain".)

Geoffrey S. Mendelson N30WJ (215) 242-8712 gsm@mendelson.com

Date: Thu, 21 Apr 1994 18:34:34 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!
mlb.semi.harris.com!controls.ccd.harris.com!bal@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Upgraded license expiration question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

It seems like all this group talks about is the code/no-code debate. In order to maybe stimulate a different thread, I pose the following question:

A question about United States call sign expiration.

If you receive a new call sign, when does the old call sign expire?

For example:

A person takes an examination and upgrades their license. The person wants a new call sign so they check the box on the 610 form requesting a new call.

It is my understanding (provided that the person already has a license) that the person can operate with their old call sign for a period time (365 days?) with their new privileges. When the new call comes in the mail, the person is supposed to quit using the old call and use the new call.

But what if for some reason they don't care for the new call? Can they continue to use the old call and in the mean time apply for a new call? If they do, is this illegal? If illegal, when does the old call expire?.. At the date of issue by the FCC?... At the time that the person signs the new license?

Another:

What if at three different testing sessions, the person passes general written, advanced written, and then 13 wpm in that order. Lets say the person already holds a Technician w/HF from the 4 call area. The person is entitled at the last test session for a Advanced class license.

The person wants a new call sign so they check the box. Ten weeks later (or the current waiting period) they receive a general class license in the mail with a new 2X3 call sign! It is soon found out that there has been a mistake. A VE, by accident, put the wrong date (previous year) on the advanced written CSCE. This invalidated the CSCE since it now seemed more than a year old, hence the general class license issued by the FCC.

This could all be cleared up in a few months (another 610 to the FCC) but the operator has a new 2X3 call. The operator really wants one of the advanced class call signs from block B. Do they have to use the new 2X3 call or can they use the old 2X3 call sign until things are cleared up with the FCC?

73, Bruce KR4AQ

--

Bruce Lifter
Harris Corporation
Controls Division

MS: R5-202

email: blifter@ccd.harris.com

-... . -.- .-.- .- ---.-

de KR4AQ

Date: 24 Apr 1994 08:06:43 -0700

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!udel!
news2.sprintlink.net!news.sprintlink.net!connected.com!connected.com!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <paulf.767130549@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>,
<2pc1d8\$qmk@ccnet.ccnet.com>, <paulf.767164384@abercrombie.stanford.edu>r-
Subject : Re: rec.radio.amateur.vhf.plus (?)

Since the VHF list out of Stanford is now up as a LISTSERV consider this
a dead issue IMHO...I'm not going to do anything else with it

Ralph Lindberg N7BSN

Date: Sat, 23 Apr 1994 22:46:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
news.intercon.com!news.pipeline.com!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2p8ulf\$ov4@bigfoot.wustl.edu>, <042394000906Rnf0.77b9@amcomp.com>,
<2pc8o8\$6uc@bigfoot.wustl.edu>news.p
Subject : Re: FCC computers

j1w3@cec3.wustl.edu (Jesse L Wei) writes:

>Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:

>: j1w3@cec3.wustl.edu (Jesse L Wei) writes:

>

>: >Here's the latest FCC laugh -- I called the Gettysburg office today and

>: >the first thing I heard was "our computers are down. . ."

>: >Go figure. . .Does this mean processing times will fall another week behind???

>: Depends on how much time the people at Gettysburg spend on the phone

>: answering questions vs. issuing licenses.

>

>I don't know if you were trying to be *smart* but FYI, the people there don't

>answer questions until *they* answer the phone. Their answering machine

>doesn't count. And also, if you still think you're smart, I was instructed

>by both the VEC and the ARRL to call the FCC as I have been waiting for my

>license for over 17 weeks.

What VEC? The ARRL VEC? Or did you mean the VE's and the ARRL VEC told you to call. However, if you were told the average wait was 10 to 12 weeks and you have waited 17 weeks it is reasonable to call. If it has only been 7 weeks and you are calling regularly then you are just wasting the FCC's time and CAUSING delays. Now, do I need to spell it out step by step for you? Or can you understand that every hour spent on the phone is one hour that can NOT be spent issuing licenses (and doing related paperwork)?

And I don't THINK I am smart, I KNOW that I am smart. At least I can understand time management and the difference between a VE and a VEC.

Dan

--

Samuel Adams: "The Constitution shall never be construed to prevent people of the United States who are peaceable citizens from keeping their own arms."
During Massachusetts' U.S. Constitution ratification convention, (1788)

Date: 24 Apr 1994 15:13:02 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!bigfoot.wustl.edu!cec3!
j1w3@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <042394000906Rnf0.77b9@amcomp.com>, <2pc8o8\$6uc@bigfoot.wustl.edu>,
<042394224654Rnf0.77b9@amcomp.com>

Subject : Re: FCC computers

Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:
: jlw3@cec3.wustl.edu (Jesse L Wei) writes:

: >Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:

: What VEC? The ARRL VEC? Or did you mean the VE's and the ARRL VEC told you
: to call. However, if you were told the average wait was 10 to 12 weeks and
: you have waited 17 weeks it is reasonable to call. If it has only been 7
: weeks and you are calling regularly then you are just wasting the FCC's
: time and CAUSING delays. Now, do I need to spell it out step by step for
: you? Or can you understand that every hour spent on the phone is one hour
: that can NOT be spent issuing licenses (and doing related paperwork)?

No, it wasn't the ARRL VEC. I called W5YI-VEC. Yes, the VEC, in Arlington,
Texas. They answer W5YI-VEC, W5YI-VE. And guess why? They're the
coordinator, not the examiners!! Sorry if I just kindof jumped the gun
there, but I get a little peaved when people tell me I shouldn't call
the FCC. My first call to the FCC wasn't until week 14. Is that waiting
long enough????

: And I don't THINK I am smart, I KNOW that I am smart. At least I can
: understand time management and the difference between a VE and a VEC.

You know, I'd be surprised, you thought I called the VE ;))
I *did* call the VEC, not the VE, and I *do* understand time management.
I wrote Bart Jahnke (remember him??? If you don't look in _QST_ for the
examination coordinator under ARRL staff) and *he* also told me to call.
I personally thought 14 weeks was a long enough wait. Is that time
management you mentioned supposed to apply to yourself or the FCC??? That
really didn't make any sense.

Again, sorry that I kinda exploded there, but you should realize that
some people *do* wait the waiting period and try all other resources
before calling the FCC before you say that it is wasting everybody's time.
Even if it *is* wasting everybody's time. . .

--jesse

Date: 24 Apr 1994 00:21:32 GMT
From: yar.cs.wisc.edu!jhanson@rsch.wisc.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2p8ulf\$ov4@bigfoot.wustl.edu>, <042394000906Rnf0.77b9@amcomp.com>,
<2pc8o8\$6uc@bigfoot.wustl.edu>n
Subject : Re: FCC computers

Jesse L Wei <jlw3@cec3.wustl.edu> wrote:

>Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:

>: Depends on how much time the people at Gettysburg spend on the phone

>: answering questions vs. issuing licenses.

>

>I don't know if you were trying to be *smart* but FYI, the people there don't
>answer questions until *they* answer the phone. Their answering machine
>doesn't count. And also, if you still think you're smart, I was instructed
>by both the VEC and the ARRL to call the FCC as I have been waiting for my
>license for over 17 weeks.

Whoa, slow down! In your case, I'm confident a call to Gettysburg is
warrented. But, I think Dan had a good point overall. If one calls them, it
is time they are not entering licenses into the computer. That's why they tell
you not to even think about it for 8-10 weeks.

And, if you think you're smart, it's really a voice mailbox. :)

--

Jason J. Hanson		1510 Tripp Circle #VI309		(608) 264-1079
Univ. of Wisconsin		Madison, WI 53706-1294		Ham: N9LEA (Extra)
-- jhanson@yar.cs.wisc.edu		=***=		n9lea@k9iu.#sin.in.usa.na --

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #183
